


## Free Executive Summary

### Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage: Public Report



Committee on the Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage, National Research Council  
ISBN: 978-0-309-09645-4, 126 pages, 8 1/2 x 11, (2006)

This free executive summary is provided by the National Academies as part of our mission to educate the world on issues of science, engineering, and health. If you are interested in reading the full book, please visit us online at <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11263.html>. You may browse and search the full, authoritative version for free; you may also purchase a print or electronic version of the book. If you have questions or just want more information about the books published by the National Academies Press, please contact our customer service department toll-free at 888-624-8373.

*At the request of the U.S. Congress, the National Academies assessed the safety and security of spent nuclear fuel stored in pools and dry casks at commercial nuclear power plants in the United States. The public report can be viewed on the National Academies Press website at <http://books.nap.edu/catalog/11263.html>.*

**This executive summary plus thousands more available at [www.nap.edu](http://www.nap.edu).**

Copyright © National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved. Unless otherwise indicated, all materials in this PDF file are copyrighted by the National Academy of Sciences. Distribution or copying is strictly prohibited without permission of the National Academies Press <http://www.nap.edu/permissions/>. Permission is granted for this material to be posted on a secure password-protected Web site. The content may not be posted on a public Web site.

## NOTE TO READERS

This report is based on a classified report that was developed at the request of the U.S. Congress with sponsorship from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Department of Homeland Security. This report contains all of the findings and recommendations that appear in the classified report. Some have been slightly reworded and other sensitive information that might allow terrorists to exploit potential vulnerabilities has been redacted to protect national security. Nevertheless, the National Research Council and the authoring committee believe that this report provides an accurate summary of the classified report, including its findings and recommendations.

The authoring committee for this report examined the potential consequences of a large number of scenarios for attacking spent fuel storage facilities at commercial nuclear power plants. Some of these scenarios were developed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as part of its ongoing vulnerability analyses, whereas others were developed by the committee based upon the expertise of its members or suggestions from participants at the committee's open meetings. The committee focused its discussions about terrorist attacks on the concept of *maximum credible scenarios*. These are defined by the committee to be physically realistic classes of attacks that, if carried out successfully, would produce the most serious potential consequences within that class. In a practical sense they can be said to *bound* the consequences for a given type of attack. Such scenarios could in some cases be very difficult to carry out because they require a high level of skill and knowledge or luck on the part of the attackers. It was nevertheless useful to analyze these scenarios because they provide decision makers with a better understanding of the full range of potential consequences from terrorist attacks.

The committee uses the term *potential consequences* advisedly. It is important to recognize that a terrorist attack on a spent fuel storage facility would not necessarily result in the release of any radioactivity to the environment. The consequences of such an attack would depend not only on the nature of the attack itself, but also on the construction of the spent fuel storage facility; its location relative to surrounding features that might shield it from the attack; and the ability of the guards and operators at the facility to respond to the attack and/or mitigate its consequences. Facility-specific analyses are required to determine the potential vulnerability of a given facility to a given type of terrorist attack.

Congress asked the National Research Council for technical advice related to the vulnerability of spent fuel storage facilities to terrorist attacks. Congress, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Department of Homeland Security are responsible for translating this advice into policy actions. This will require the balancing of costs, risks, and benefits across the nation's industrial infrastructure. The committee was not asked to examine the potential vulnerabilities of other types of infrastructure to terrorist attacks or the consequences of such attacks. While such comparisons will likely be difficult, they will be essential for ensuring that the nation's limited resources are used judiciously in protecting its citizens from terrorist attacks.



## SUMMARY FOR CONGRESS

The U.S. Congress asked the National Academies to provide independent scientific and technical advice on the safety and security of commercial spent nuclear fuel storage in the United States, specifically with respect to the following charges:

- Potential safety and security risks of spent nuclear fuel presently stored in cooling pools at commercial nuclear reactor sites.
- Safety and security advantages, if any, of dry cask storage versus wet pool storage at these reactor sites.
- Potential safety and security advantages, if any, of dry cask storage using various single-, dual-, and multi-purpose cask designs.
- The risks of terrorist attacks on these materials and the risk these materials might be used to construct a radiological dispersal device.

Congress requested that the National Academies produce a classified report that addresses these charges within 6 months and also provide an unclassified summary for unlimited public distribution. The first request was fulfilled in July 2004. This report fulfills the second request.

The highlights of the report are as follows:

- (1) Spent fuel pools are necessary at all operating nuclear power plants to store recently discharged fuel.
- (2) The committee judges that successful terrorist attacks on spent fuel pools, though difficult, are possible.
- (3) If an attack leads to a propagating zirconium cladding fire, it could result in the release of large amounts of radioactive material.
- (4) Additional analyses are needed to understand more fully the vulnerabilities and consequences of events that could lead to propagating zirconium cladding fires.
- (5) It appears to be feasible to reduce the likelihood of a zirconium cladding fire by rearranging spent fuel assemblies in the pool and making provision for water-spray systems that would be able to cool the fuel, even if the pool or overlying building were severely damaged.
- (6) Dry cask storage has inherent security advantages over spent fuel pool storage, but it can only be used to store older spent fuel.
- (7) There are no large security differences among different storage-cask designs.
- (8) It would be difficult for terrorists to steal enough spent fuel from storage facilities for use in significant radiological dispersal devices (dirty bombs).

The statement of task does not direct the committee to recommend whether the transfer of spent fuel from pool to dry cask storage should be accelerated. The committee judges, however, that further engineering analyses and cost-benefit studies would be needed before decisions on this and other mitigative measures are taken. The report contains detailed recommendations for improving the security of spent fuel storage regardless of how it is stored.



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the Fiscal Year 2004 Energy and Water Development Conference Report, the U.S. Congress asked the National Academies to provide independent scientific and technical advice on the safety and security<sup>1</sup> of commercial spent nuclear fuel storage in the United States, specifically with respect to the following four charges:

- (1) Potential safety and security risks of spent nuclear fuel presently stored in cooling pools at commercial reactor sites.
- (2) Safety and security advantages, if any, of dry cask storage versus wet pool storage at these reactor sites.
- (3) Potential safety and security advantages, if any, of dry cask storage using various single-, dual-, and multi-purpose cask designs.
- (4) The risks of terrorist attacks on these materials and the risk these materials might be used to construct a radiological dispersal device.

Congress requested that the National Academies produce a classified report that addresses these charges within 6 months and also provide an unclassified summary for unlimited public distribution. The first request was fulfilled in July 2004. This report fulfills the second request.

Spent nuclear fuel is stored at commercial nuclear power plant sites in two configurations:

- In water-filled pools, referred to as *spent fuel pools*.
- In *dry casks* that are designed either for storage (single-purpose casks) or both storage and transportation (dual-purpose casks). There are two basic cask designs: bare-fuel casks and canister-based casks, which can be licensed for either single- or dual-purpose use, depending on their design.

Spent fuel pools are currently in use at all 65 sites with operating commercial nuclear power reactors, at 8 sites where commercial power reactors have been shut down, and at one site not associated with an operating or shutdown power reactor. Dry-cask storage facilities have been established at 28 operating, shutdown, or decommissioned power plants. The nuclear industry projects that up to three or four nuclear power plants will reach full capacity in their spent fuel pools each year for at least the next 17 years.

The congressional request for this study was prompted by conflicting public claims about the safety and security of commercial spent nuclear fuel storage at nuclear power plants. Some analysts have argued that the dense packing of spent fuel in cooling pools at nuclear power plants does not allow a sufficient safety margin in the event of a loss-of-pool-coolant event from an accident or terrorist attack. They assert that such events could result in the release of large quantities of radioactive material to the environment if the zirconium cladding of the spent fuel overheats and ignites. To reduce the potential for such fires, these

---

<sup>1</sup> In the context of this study, *safety* refers to measures that protect spent nuclear fuel storage facilities against failure, damage, human error, or other accidents that would disperse radioactivity in the environment. *Security* refers to measures to protect spent fuel storage facilities against sabotage, attacks, or theft.

analysts have suggested that spent fuel more than five years old be removed from the pool and stored in dry casks, and that the remaining younger fuel be reconfigured in the pool to allow more space for air cooling in the event of a loss-of-pool-coolant event.

The committee that was appointed to perform the present study examined the vulnerability of spent fuel stored in pools and dry casks to accidents and terrorist attacks. Any event that results in the breach of a spent fuel pool or a dry cask, whether accidental or intentional, has the potential to release radioactive material to the environment. The committee therefore focused its limited time on understanding two issues: (1) Under what circumstances could pools or casks be breached? And (2) what would be the radioactive releases from such breaches?

To address these questions, the committee performed a critical review of the security analyses that have been carried out by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its contractors, the Department of Homeland Security, industry, and other independent experts to determine if they are objective, complete, and credible. The committee was unable to examine several important issues related to these questions either because it was unable to obtain needed information from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or because of time constraints. Details are provided in Chapters 1 and 2.

The committee's findings and recommendations from this analysis are provided below, organized by the four charges of the study task. The ordering of the charges has been rearranged to provide a more logical exposition of results.

#### **CHARGE 4: RISKS OF TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THESE MATERIALS AND THE RISK THESE MATERIALS MIGHT BE USED TO CONSTRUCT A RADIOLOGICAL DISPERSAL DEVICE**

The concept of *risk* as applied to terrorist attacks underpins the entire statement of task for this study. Therefore, the committee examined this final charge first to provide the basis for addressing the remainder of the task statement. The committee's examination of Charge 4 is provided in Chapter 2. On the basis of this examination, the committee offers the following findings and recommendations numbered according to the chapters in which they appear:

**FINDING 2A: The probability of terrorist attacks on spent fuel storage cannot be assessed quantitatively or comparatively. Spent fuel storage facilities cannot be dismissed as targets for such attacks because it is not possible to predict the behavior and motivations of terrorists, and because of the attractiveness of spent fuel as a terrorist target given the well known public dread of radiation.** Terrorists view nuclear power plant facilities as desirable targets because of the large inventories of radioactivity they contain. While it would be difficult to attack such facilities, the committee judges that attacks by knowledgeable terrorists with access to appropriate technical means are possible. It is important to recognize, however, that an attack that damages a power plant or its spent fuel storage facilities would not necessarily result in the release of *any* radioactivity to the environment. There are potential steps that can be taken to lower the potential consequences of such attacks.

**FINDING 2B:** The committee judges that the likelihood terrorists could steal enough spent fuel for use in a significant radiological dispersal device is small. Removal of a spent fuel assembly from the pool or dry cask would prove extremely difficult under almost any terrorist attack scenario. Attempts by a knowledgeable insider(s) to remove single rods and related debris from the pool might prove easier, but the amount of material that could be removed would be small. Moreover, superior materials could be stolen or purchased more easily from other sources. Even though the likelihood of spent fuel theft appears to be small, it is nevertheless important that the protection of these materials be maintained and improved as vulnerabilities are identified.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should review and upgrade, where necessary, its security requirements for protecting spent fuel rods not contained in fuel assemblies from theft by knowledgeable insiders, especially in facilities where individual fuel rods or portions of rods are being stored in pools.

**FINDING 2C:** A number of security improvements at nuclear power plants have been instituted since the events of September 11, 2001. However, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission did not provide the committee with enough information to evaluate the effectiveness of these procedures for protecting stored spent fuel. Surveillance and other human-factors related security procedures are just as important as the physical barriers in preventing and mitigating terrorist attacks. Although the committee did learn about some of the changes that have been instituted since the September 11, 2001, attacks, it was not provided with enough information to evaluate the effectiveness of procedures now in place.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Although the committee did not specifically investigate the effectiveness and adequacy of improved surveillance and security measures for protecting stored spent fuel, an assessment of current measures should be performed by an independent<sup>2</sup> organization.

## **CHARGE 1: POTENTIAL SAFETY AND SECURITY RISKS OF SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL STORED IN POOLS**

The committee's examination of Charge 1 is provided in Chapter 3. On the basis of this examination, the committee offers the following findings and recommendations:

**FINDING 3A:** Pool storage is required at all operating commercial nuclear power plants to cool newly discharged spent fuel. Freshly discharged spent fuel generates too much decay heat to be passively air cooled. This fuel must be stored in a pool that has an active heat removal system (i.e., water pumps and heat exchangers) for at least one year before being moved to dry storage. Most dry storage systems are licensed to store fuel that has been out of the reactor for at least five years. Although spent fuel younger than five years could be stored in dry casks, the changes required for shielding and heat-removal

---

<sup>2</sup> That is, independent of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the nuclear industry.

could be substantial, especially for fuel that has been discharged for less than about three years.

**FINDING 3B:** The committee finds that, under some conditions, a terrorist attack that partially or completely drained a spent fuel pool could lead to a propagating zirconium cladding fire and the release of large quantities of radioactive materials to the environment. Details are provided in the committee's classified report.

**FINDING 3C:** It appears to be feasible to reduce the likelihood of a zirconium cladding fire following a loss-of-pool-coolant event using readily implemented measures. The following measures appear to have particular merit: Reconfiguring the spent fuel in the pools (i.e., redistribution of high decay-heat assemblies so that they are surrounded by low decay-heat assemblies) to more evenly distribute decay-heat loads and enhance radiative heat transfer; limiting the frequency of offloads of full reactor cores into spent fuel pools, requiring longer shutdowns of the reactor before any fuel is offloaded, and providing enhanced security when such offloads must be made; and development of a redundant and diverse response system to mitigate loss-of-pool-coolant events that would be capable of operation even if the pool or overlying building were severely damaged.

**FINDING 3D:** The potential vulnerabilities of spent fuel pools to terrorist attacks are plant-design specific. Therefore, specific vulnerabilities can be understood only by examining the characteristics of spent fuel storage at each plant. As described in Chapter 3, there are substantial differences in the designs of spent fuel pools that make them more or less vulnerable to certain types of terrorist attacks.

**FINDING 3E:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission and independent analysts have made progress in understanding some vulnerabilities of spent fuel pools to certain terrorist attacks and the consequences of such attacks for releases of radioactivity to the environment. However, additional work on specific issues is needed urgently. The analyses carried out to date provide a general understanding of spent fuel behavior in a loss-of-pool-coolant event and the vulnerability of spent fuel pools to certain terrorist attacks that could cause such events to occur. The work to date, however, has not been sufficient to adequately understand the vulnerabilities and consequences of such events. Additional analyses are needed to fill in the knowledge gaps so that well-informed policy decisions can be made.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should undertake additional best-estimate analyses to more fully understand the vulnerabilities and consequences of loss-of-pool-coolant events that could lead to a zirconium cladding fire. Based on these analyses, the Commission should take appropriate actions to address any significant vulnerabilities that are identified. The committee provides details on additional analyses that should be carried out in its classified report. Cost-benefit considerations will be an important part of such decisions.

**RECOMMENDATION:** While the work described in the previous recommendation under Finding 3E, above, is being carried out, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should ensure that power plant operators take prompt and effective measures to reduce the consequences of loss-of-pool-coolant

**events in spent fuel pools that could result in propagating zirconium cladding fires.** The committee judges that there are at least two such measures that should be implemented promptly:

- Reconfiguring of fuel in the pools so that high decay-heat fuel assemblies are surrounded by low decay-heat assemblies. This will more evenly distribute decay-heat loads, thus enhancing radiative heat transfer in the event of a loss of pool coolant.
- Provision for water-spray systems that would be able to cool the fuel even if the pool or overlying building were severely damaged.

Reconfiguring of fuel in the pool would be a prudent measure that could probably be implemented at all plants at little cost, time, or exposure of workers to radiation. The second measure would probably be more expensive to implement and may not be needed at all plants, particularly plants in which spent fuel pools are located below grade or are protected from external line-of-sight attacks by exterior walls and other structures.

The committee anticipates that the costs and benefits of options for implementing the second measure would be examined to help decide what requirements would be imposed. Further, the committee does not presume to anticipate the best design of such a system—whether it should be installed on the walls of a pool or deployed from a location where it is unlikely to be compromised by the same attack—but simply notes the demanding requirements such a system must meet.

### **CHARGE 3: POTENTIAL SAFETY AND SECURITY ADVANTAGES, IF ANY, OF DIFFERENT DRY CASK STORAGE DESIGNS**

The third charge to the committee focuses exclusively on the safety and security of dry casks. The committee addressed this charge first in Chapter 4 to provide the basis for the comparative analysis between dry casks and pools as called for in Charge 2.

**FINDING 4A:** Although there are differences in the robustness of different dry cask designs (e.g., bare-fuel versus canister-based), the differences are not large when measured by the absolute magnitudes of radionuclide releases in the event of a breach. All storage cask designs are vulnerable to some types of terrorist attacks, but the quantity of radioactive material releases predicted from such attacks is relatively small. These releases are not easily dispersed in the environment.

**FINDING 4B:** Additional steps can be taken to make dry casks less vulnerable to potential terrorist attacks. Although the vulnerabilities of current cask designs are already small, additional, relatively simple steps can be taken to reduce them as discussed in Chapter 4.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should consider using the results of the vulnerability analyses for possible upgrades of requirements in 10 CFR 72 for dry casks, specifically to improve their resistance to terrorist attacks. The committee was told by

Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff that such a step is already under consideration.

## **CHARGE 2: SAFETY AND SECURITY ADVANTAGES, IF ANY, OF DRY CASK STORAGE VERSUS WET POOL STORAGE**

In Chapter 4, the committee offers the following findings and recommendations with respect to the comparative component of Charge 2:

**FINDING 4C: Dry cask storage does not eliminate the need for pool storage at operating commercial reactors.** Under present U.S. practices, dry cask storage can only be used to store fuel that has been out of the reactor long enough (generally greater than five years under current practices) to be passively air cooled.

**FINDING 4D: Dry cask storage for older, cooler spent fuel has two inherent advantages over pool storage: (1) It is a passive system that relies on natural air circulation for cooling; and (2) it divides the inventory of that spent fuel among a large number of discrete, robust containers. These factors make it more difficult to attack a large amount of spent fuel at one time and also reduce the consequences of such attacks.** The robust construction of these casks prevents large-scale releases of radioactivity in all of the attack scenarios examined by the committee in its classified report.

**FINDING 4E: Depending on the outcome of plant-specific vulnerability analyses described in the committee's classified report, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission might determine that earlier movements of spent fuel from pools into dry cask storage would be prudent to reduce the potential consequences of terrorist attacks on pools at some commercial nuclear plants.** The statement of task directs the committee to examine the risks of spent fuel storage options and alternatives for decision makers, not to recommend whether any spent fuel should be transferred from pool storage to cask storage. In fact, there may be some commercial plants that, because of pool designs or fuel loadings, may require some removal of spent fuel from their pools. If there is a need to remove spent fuel from the pools it should become clearer once the vulnerability and consequence analyses described in the classified report are completed. The committee expects that cost-benefit considerations would be a part of these analyses.

## **IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES**

Implementation of the recommendations in Chapters 2-4 will require action and cooperation by a large number of parties. The final chapter of the report provides a brief discussion of two implementation issues that the committee believes are of special interest to Congress: *Timing Issues*: Ensuring that high-quality, expert analyses are completed in a timely manner; and *Communications Issues*: Ensuring that the results of the analyses are communicated to relevant parties so that appropriate and timely mitigating actions can be taken. This discussion leads to the following finding and recommendation.

**FINDING 5A: Security restrictions on sharing of information and analyses are hindering progress in addressing potential vulnerabilities of spent fuel storage to**

**terrorist attacks.** Current classification and security practices appear to discourage information sharing between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and industry. They impede the review and feedback processes that can enhance the technical soundness of the analyses being carried out; they make it difficult to build support within the industry for potential mitigative measures; and they may undermine the confidence that the industry, expert panels such as this one, and the public place in the adequacy of such measures.

**RECOMMENDATION: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission should improve the sharing of pertinent information on vulnerability and consequence analyses of spent fuel storage with nuclear power plant operators and dry cask storage system vendors on a timely basis.**

The committee also believes that the public is an important audience for the work being carried out to assess and mitigate vulnerabilities of spent fuel storage facilities. While it would be inappropriate to share all information publicly, more constructive interaction with the public and independent analysts could improve the work being carried out and also increase public confidence in Nuclear Regulatory Commission and industry decisions and actions to reduce the vulnerability of spent fuel storage to terrorist threats.

# **SAFETY AND SECURITY OF COMMERCIAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL STORAGE**

**Public Report**

Committee on the Safety and Security of Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Storage

Board on Radioactive Waste Management

Division on Earth and Life Studies

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL  
*OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES*

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS  
Washington, D.C.  
[www.nap.edu](http://www.nap.edu)

**THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS 500 Fifth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001**

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

This study was supported by grant number NRC-04-04-067 between the National Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organizations or agencies that provided support for the project.

International Standard Book Number 0-309-09647-2  
Library of Congress Control Number 2005926244

Additional copies of this report are available from the National Academies Press, 500 Fifth Street, N.W., Lockbox 285, Washington, DC 20055; (800) 624-6242 or (202) 334-3313 (in the Washington metropolitan area); Internet, <http://www.nap.edu>

*Front cover:* Design by Michele de la Menardiere from photos courtesy of the Nuclear Energy Institute.

Copyright 2006 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

# **THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES**

*Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine*

The **National Academy of Sciences** is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The **National Academy of Engineering** was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Wm. A. Wulf is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The **Institute of Medicine** was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Harvey V. Fineberg is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The **National Research Council** was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone and Dr. Wm. A. Wulf are chair and vice chair, respectively, of the National Research Council

**[www.national-academies.org](http://www.national-academies.org)**

## COMMITTEE ON THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF COMMERCIAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL STORAGE

LOUIS J. LANZEROTTI, *Chair*, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, and Lucent Technologies, Murray Hill  
CARL A. ALEXANDER, Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio  
ROBERT M. BERNERO, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (retired), Gaithersburg, Maryland  
M. QUINN BREWSTER, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
GREGORY R. CHOPPIN, Florida State University, Tallahassee  
NANCY J. COOKE, Arizona State University, Mesa  
LOUIS ANTHONY COX, Jr.,<sup>1</sup> Cox Associates, Inc., Denver, Colorado  
GORDON R. JOHNSON, Network Computing Services, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
ROBERT P. KENNEDY, RPK Structural Mechanics Consulting, Escondido, California  
KENNETH K. KUO, Pennsylvania State University, University Park  
RICHARD T. LAHEY, Jr., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York  
KATHLEEN R. MEYER, Keystone Scientific, Inc., Fort Collins, Colorado  
FREDERICK J. MOODY, GE Nuclear Energy (retired), Murphys, California  
TIMOTHY R. NEAL, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico  
JOHN WREATHALL,<sup>1</sup> John Wreathall & Company, Inc., Dublin, Ohio  
LORING A. WYLLIE, Jr., Degenkolb Engineers, San Francisco, California  
PETER D. ZIMMERMAN, King's College London, United Kingdom

### **Staff**

KEVIN D. CROWLEY, Study Director  
BARBARA PASTINA, Senior Program Officer  
MICAH D. LOWENTHAL, Senior Program Officer  
ELISABETH A. REESE, Program Officer  
DARLA THOMPSON, Research Associate  
TONI G. GREENLEAF, Administrative Associate

---

<sup>1</sup> Drs. Cox and Wreathall resigned from the committee on February 26 and March 17, 2004, respectively.

## BOARD ON RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT

RICHARD A. MESERVE,<sup>1</sup> *Chair*, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D.C.  
ROBERT M. BERNERO, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (retired), Gaithersburg,  
Maryland  
SUE B. CLARK, Washington State University, Pullman  
ALLEN G. CROFF, Oak Ridge National Laboratory (retired), Tennessee  
DAVID E. DANIEL, University of Illinois, Urbana  
RODNEY C. EWING, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor  
ROGER L. HAGENGRUBER, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque  
KLAUS KÜHN, Technische Universität Clausthal, Germany  
HOWARD C. KUNREUTHER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia  
SUSAN M. LANGHORST, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri  
NIKOLAI P. LAVEROV, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow  
MILTON LEVENSON, Bechtel International (retired), Menlo Park, California  
PAUL A. LOCKE, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland  
NORINE E. NOONAN, College of Charleston, South Carolina  
EUGENE A. ROSA, Washington State University, Pullman  
ATSUYUKI SUZUKI, Nuclear Safety Commission of Japan, Tokyo

### ***Staff***

KEVIN D. CROWLEY, Director  
MICAH D. LOWENTHAL, Senior Program Officer  
BARBARA PASTINA, Senior Program Officer  
JOHN R. WILEY, Senior Program Officer  
TONI GREENLEAF, Administrative Associate  
DARLA J. THOMPSON, Research Associate  
LAURA D. LLANOS, Senior Program Assistant  
MARILI ULLOA, Senior Program Assistant  
JAMES YATES, JR., Office Assistant

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Meserve did not participate in the oversight of this study.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the help of several organizations and individuals who were called upon for information and advice. The committee would like to acknowledge especially the following organizations and individuals for their help:

- Congressional staff members Kevin Cook, Terry Tyborowski, and Jeanne Wilson (retired) for their guidance on the study task.
- Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff Farouk Eltawila, who served as the primary liaison for this study, and Charles Tinkler and Francis (Skip) Young for their support of the committee's information-gathering activities.
- Department of Homeland Security staff member Jon MacLaren, who also served as a liaison to the committee.
- Steve Kraft and John Vincent (deceased) of the Nuclear Energy Institute and staff of Energy Resources International for providing information about spent fuel storage practices in industry.
- ENTERGY Corp., Exelon Corp, and Arizona Public Service Corp. staff for organizing tours of the Braidwood, Dresden, Indian Point, and Palo Verde nuclear generating stations.
- German organizations and individuals who helped organize a tour of spent fuel storage facilities in Germany. These organizations and individuals are explicitly acknowledged in Appendix C.
- Speakers (see Appendix A) and participants at committee meetings as well as those who sent written comments for providing their knowledge and perspectives on this important matter.

This report has been reviewed in draft form by individuals chosen for their diverse perspectives and technical expertise, in accordance with procedures approved by the National Research Council's Report Review Committee. The purpose of this independent review is to provide candid and critical comments that will assist the institution in making its published report as sound as possible and to ensure that the report meets institutional standards for objectivity, evidence, and responsiveness to the study charge. The content of the review comments and draft manuscript remain confidential to protect the integrity of the deliberative process. We wish to thank the following individuals for their review of this report:

John F. Ahearn, Sigma Xi and Duke University  
Romesh C. Batra, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Robert J. Budnitz, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
Philip R. Clark, GPU Nuclear Corporation (retired)  
Richard L. Garwin, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
Roger L. Hagengruber, The University of New Mexico  
Darleane C. Hoffman, E.O. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory  
Melvin F. Kanninen, MFK Consulting Services  
Milton Levenson, Bechtel International (retired)  
Allison Macfarlane, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Richard A. Meserve, Carnegie Institution of Washington

Donald R. Olander, University of California, Berkeley  
Theofanis G. Theofanous, University of California, Santa Barbara  
George W. Ullrich, SAIC  
Frank N. von Hippel, Princeton University

Although the reviewers listed above have provided many constructive comments and suggestions, they were not asked to endorse the report's conclusions or recommendations, nor did they see the final draft of the report before its release. The review of this report was overseen by Chris G. Whipple, ENVIRON International Corporation, and R. Stephen Berry, University of Chicago. Appointed by the National Research Council, they were responsible for making certain that an independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with institutional procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered. Responsibility for the final content of this report rests entirely with the authoring committee and the institution.

# CONTENTS

**Note to Readers, 1**

**Summary for Congress, 3**

**Executive Summary, 5**

- 1. Introduction and Background, 12**
  - 1.1 Context for this study, 12
  - 1.2 Strategy to address the study charges, 13
  - 1.3 Report roadmap, 16
  - 1.4 Background on spent nuclear fuel and its storage, 16
- 2. Terrorist Attacks on Spent Fuel Storage, 25**
  - 2.1 Background on risk, 25
  - 2.2 Terrorist attack scenarios, 28
  - 2.3 Risks of terrorist attacks on spent fuel storage facilities, 34
  - 2.4 Findings and recommendations, 36
- 3. Spent Fuel Pool Storage, 38**
  - 3.1 Background on spent fuel pool storage, 40
  - 3.2 Previous studies on safety and security of pool storage, 44
  - 3.3 Evaluation of the potential risks of pool storage, 47
  - 3.4 Findings and recommendations, 57
- 4. Dry Cask Storage and Comparative Risks, 60**
  - 4.1 Background on dry cask storage, 61
  - 4.2 Evaluation of potential risks of dry cask storage, 64
  - 4.3 Potential advantages of dry storage over wet storage, 68
  - 4.4 Findings and recommendations, 69
- 5. Implementation Issues, 75**
  - 5.1 Timing issues, 75
  - 5.2 Communication issues, 75
  - 5.3 Finding and recommendation, 77

**References, 79**

## **Appendixes**

- A. Information-gathering sessions, 83
- B. Biographical sketches of committee members, 87
- C. Tour of selected spent fuel storage-related installations in Germany, 92
- D. Historical development of current commercial power reactor fuel operations, 100
- E. Glossary, 108
- F. Acronyms, 115

